

REMARKS

Claims 29-49 were pending when the current Office Action was mailed. Claims 38-42 and 44-45 remain withdrawn. Claims 29, 32, 34, 46, and 48 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Therefore, claims 29-49 remain pending and are resubmitted for consideration.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection

Claims 29-32, 34-37, 43, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,113,131 (“Uehara”). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Amended claim 29 calls for a method of making a cover component mountable to an airbag system that comprises, among other things, molding a moldable material using a die to form a recessed line, irradiating the molded material with a laser to bore a plurality of hollows, and “wherein a bottom recess of the recessed line at the first or second end of the recessed line is molded to form a slope inclined relative to a back of the cover component,” which Uehara fails to disclose, teach, or suggest. Additionally, Uehara fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a method of manufacturing a cover component that comprises, among other things, forming a recessed line by using a raised line provided on a die, boring hollows in the recessed line by laser processing, and wherein “a bottom recess of the recessed line at the first or second end of the recessed line is molded to form a slope inclined relative to a back of the cover component” as recited by amended claim 46.

The Examiner has attached an annotated version of Figure 4B of Uehara to the Office Action. The annotated figure shows a line at an angle to the back of the cover. The line is drawn along the side of the groove 31b. The Examiner has provided the annotated figure to support the rejection, but Fig. 4B actually clearly discloses that Uehara fails to anticipate the claimed invention. The angle or slope allegedly disclosed in Figure 4B is not at the “first or second end of the recessed line.” Rather, the annotation on Fig. 4B is a line located on one of the opposing sides of a groove not a first or second end. Thus, Uehara fails to anticipate

claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30-32, 34-37, 43, and 47-48 depend from claim 29 or claim 46 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 29-37, 43, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,773 (“Sawada”) in view of Uehara. The rejection should be withdrawn at least because the references, taken together or separately, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, neither Sawada nor Uehara (together or separately) disclose, teach or suggest a method of making a cover component mountable to an airbag system that comprises, among other things, molding a moldable material using a die to form a recessed line, irradiating the molded material with a laser to bore a plurality of hollows, and “wherein a bottom recess of the recessed line at the first or second end of the recessed line is molded to form a slope inclined relative to a back of the cover component” as called for in claim 29. Further by way of example, neither Sawada nor Uehara (together or separately) disclose, teach, or suggest a method of manufacturing a cover component that comprises, among other things, forming a recessed line by using a raised line provided on a die, and boring hollows in the recessed line by laser processing, and wherein “a bottom recess of the recessed line at the first or second end of the recessed line is molded to form a slope inclined relative to a back of the cover component” as recited by amended claim 46.

The Examiner contends that Figure 4 of Sawada discloses a recessed line molded to form a slope. *See* Office Action at p. 6. However, Figure 4 of Sawada merely discloses a sloped central portion of a recessed line and not a first or second end. *See* Figure 4 of Sawada and *see* Figure 3 of Sawada. Uehara fails to cure the deficiencies of Sawada. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 30-37, 43, and 47-49 depend from claim 29 or claim 46 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extension fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 12, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5582
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Jessica M Cahill Reg. #56,986
for Howard N. Shipley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,370